REMARKS

Claims 14–15 were pending at the time of the Office Action. Claim 14 has been amended. Claim 15 has been canceled. The amendment adds no new subject matter and is supported by the specification at page 9, lines 3–7 and in Figs. 2 and 3A, among other places.

Applicants note that the subject application is a divisional of U.S. patent application Serial No. 09/657,020, now U.S. Patent No. 6,537,130. Also, co-pending U.S. patent application Serial No. 09/992,170, now allowed, is another divisional of this same parent application.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,642,417, issued to Van Holdt in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,435,855 B1, issued to Sakurai. Van Holdt describes a release device for a diecasting assembly including a flexible pin. However, Van Holdt does not teach or suggest that, when a mold is closed, two pins abut with each other between a first undercut region and a second undercut region and align with each other to form a single bore in the molded part, as recited in Claim 14. Additionally, Van Holdt does not teach or suggest that the molded part is retained on the first pin after leaving a first plate for further mold release and on the second pin after leaving a second plate before being ejected from the mold.

To the contrary, one end of the flexible pin described by Van Holdt must move in a direction inclined to the direction of die movement and, therefore, cannot abut with a similar pin between a first undercut region and a second undercut region and align with each other to form a single bore in the molded part, as recited in Claim 14. For example, as depicted in Figures 1 and 2 of Van Holdt, projection 40 on flexible knockout pin 26 must travel in an inclined direction to

move away and disengage from part W. If knockout pin 26 were within a bore of part W, knockout pin 26 could neither move away from nor disengage part W.

Sakurai does not cure these deficiencies of the Van Holdt teachings, because Sakurai is silent regarding a mold having two pins that abut with each other between a first undercut region and a second undercut region and align with each other to form a single bore in the molded part, as recited in Claim 14. Additionally, Sakura does not teach or suggest that the molded part is retained on the first pin after leaving a first plate for further mold release and on the second pin after leaving a second plate before being ejected from the mold. Therefore the rejection of Claim 14 over Van Holdt in view of Sakurai is inappropriate and should be withdrawn.

Claim 14 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Holdt in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,252,051, issued to Miyamoto et al. The deficiencies of the Van Holdt teachings have been described above. Miyamoto et al. does not teach or suggest a mold having two pins that abut with each other between a first undercut region and a second undercut region and align with each other to form a single bore in the molded part, as recited in Claim 14. Also, Miyamoto et al. fails to disclose that the molded part is retained on the first pin after leaving a first plate for further mold release and on the second pin after leaving a second plate before being ejected from the mold, as recited in Claim 14. Therefore the rejection of Claim 14 over Van Holdt and in view of Miyamoto et al. is inappropriate and should be withdrawn.

Allowance of claim 14 and prompt passage of the application to issue are courteously solicited.

Sincerely yours,

Dated: JUNE 25, 2003

Martin L. Stern, Reg. No. 28,911
Robert A. Yesukevich, Reg. No. 36,064
Michael Best & Friedrich LLC
401 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 1900
Chicago, Illinois 60611
(312) 222-0800
fax: (312) 222-0818

S:\CLIENT\200801\9003\C0236346.1